

No new matter has been added by the amendments. Upon entry of these amendments, Claims 51-91 are pending. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

Rejections Under 35 USC 112:

Claims 1-44 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicants submit that these rejections are now moot in light of the cancellation of Claims 1-44. Further, Applicants submit that new Claims 51-91 are not indefinite.

Rejections Under 35 USC 102/103:

Claims 1-4, 6-12, 17-26, 29, 30 and 33-36 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC 102(b)/103 as allegedly being anticipated by or in the alternative obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,919,312 to Wierenga et al. ("Wierenga"). The Examiner asserts that Wierenga teaches a composition for cleaning cooking surfaces comprising an amine oxide, a monoethanolamine and a polyhydric alcohol, such as glycerol and/or diethylene glycol.

Claims 1-26 and 29-38 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC 103 as allegedly defining obvious subject matter over U.S. Patent No. 5,891,836 to Kacher ("Kacher"). The Examiner asserts that Kacher teaches a light-duty liquid or gel dishwashing detergent composition comprising a microemulsion forming glycol ether solvent, and amine oxide and monoethanolamine.

Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections are now moot in light of the cancellation of Claims 1-26 and 29-38. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that new Claims 51-91 are not rendered obvious over Kacher because Kacher fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention as claimed in Claims 51-91. More specifically, Kacher fails to teach a composition that comprises both a water-miscible organic solvent and a limited water-miscible organic solvent, let alone that the solvents are present in the composition at a weight ratio of from about 4:1 to about 1:20.

Claims 27 and 28 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC 103 as allegedly defining obvious subject matter over Kacher, discussed above, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,741,767 to Nicholson et al. ("Nicholson"). The Examiner recognizes that Kacher does not specifically teach the use of smectite clays. The Examiner attempts to overcome the deficiencies of Kacher by combining the teachings of Nicholson with Kacher. The Examiner asserts that Nicholson teaches a machine dishwashing composition comprising smectite clays.

Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections are now moot in light of the cancellation of Claims 27 and 28. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that new Claims 51-91 are not rendered obvious over Kacher in view of Nicholson for the same reasons that Claims 1-26 and 29-38 are not rendered obvious over Kacher.

Claims 39-44 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC 103 as allegedly defining obvious subject matter over Kacher, discussed above, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,001,789 to Trinh et al. ("Trinh"). The Examiner recognizes that Kacher fails to teach ionones, musks and cyclodextrins in its compositions. The Examiner attempts to overcome the deficiencies of Kacher by combining the teachings of Trinh with Kacher. The Examiner asserts that Trinh teaches a cleaning composition comprising ionones, musks and cyclodextrin.

Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections are now moot in light of the cancellation of Claims 39-44. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that new Claims 51-91 are not rendered obvious over Kacher in view of Trinh for the same reasons that Claims 1-26 and 29-38 are not rendered obvious over Kacher.

Claim 44 is rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by WO 98/07455. The Examiner asserts that WO 98/07455 teaches a composition containing betacyclodextrin, propylene glycol, water, etc.

Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is now moot in light of the cancellation of Claim 44. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that new Claims 51-91 are not anticipated by nor rendered obvious over WO 98/07455 because WO 98/07455 fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention as claimed in Claims 51-91. More specifically, WO 98/07455 fails to teach a composition that comprises both a water-miscible organic solvent and a limited water-miscible organic solvent, let alone that the solvents are present in the composition at a weight ratio of from about 4:1 to about 1:20.

Provisional Double Patenting Rejection:

Claims 1-44 are provisionally rejected by the Examiner under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-42 of copending Application No. 09/909,403. Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is now moot in light of the cancellation of Claims 1-44. Further, Applicants submit that even if new Claims 51-91 are rejected under this rejection, the rejection is not ripe. Applicants submit that they will address this rejection, at such time this rejection becomes ripe. If a Terminal Disclaimer is needed, then Applicants will submit one.

Conclusion

WHEREAS Applicants have made an earnest effort to overcome the rejections of the claims, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections in light of the amendments and remarks contained herein and a notice of allowance of new Claims 51-91.

Respectfully submitted,

PETER ROBERT FOLEY ET AL.



C. Brant Cook
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 39,151
(513) 627-2013

Customer # 27752
Cincinnati, OH
August 14, 2002
CM2492Amd